Meeting Summary Notes	Department of Health Office of Environmental Health & Safety ***Water Quality Subcommittee Meeting*** *January 18, 2005*		
Facilitator:	Meliss Maxfield	Note Taker(s):	Nancy Bernard
Attendees:	Wendy Jones, School Nurse Corp, ESD 114; Eric Dickson, CIH, ESD 101; Mark Cooper, SRDC Parent; Rich Hoesch, TPCHD Drinking Water; Jack Tinnea, consultant; Diane McMurray, SRDC, WSPTA; Ken Wilson, CSP, Tacoma Public Schools; Gary Jefferis, (Everett SD) SRDC WAMOA; Don Leaf, WSEHA; Marcia Harris, Deputy Superintendent, Peninsula SD, (for Sarah Drinkwater); Mike Young, Snohomish Health District (AM); Julie Awbrey, Spokane Regional HD (AM) DOH Staff: Meliss Maxfield, Derrick Dennis, Mark Soltman, Tim Hardin, Nancy Bernard, Dan Sander, Candi Wines (PM)		
Absentees:	Ron English, Seattle Public Schools (on vacation); Randy Wright, SRDC private schools alternate; Larry Fay, PHSKC, Utility Representative		
Guests:	Gregg Grunenfelder		

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Gregg Grunenfelder's comments on his meeting in Washington, DC on lead in school drinking water	Gregg shared with the group that CDC and other experts state that we are not going to find a direct relationship between drinking water and blood lead levels in children. However any exposure is not good. The national drinking water standards under the Safe Drinking Water Act are not the best place to address this issue; instead this issue needs to be addressed through building codes since plumbing is contributing to the problem. The school rule revision process is where this issue needs to be addressed. Need to develop a regulation that is implementable and enforceable. Also LHJs may or may not have a structure or training to implement these regulations, which has been the usual method. Need to remember that schools are dealing with a multitude of issues when it comes to the school environment and they have limited resources. With a multitude of issues and limited resources, how can we prioritize and make the best use of what resources we have available? The State of NY has a model that they are using an requires each district to form a health and safety (H & S) committee, and by regulation, is composed of school district personal, parents, LHJ, etc. Schools do an annual self inspection based on established criteria and bring back a report to the health and safety committee, which would decide priorities for capital and maintenance and operations requests. The model is based on more local decisions. Workgroup discussion included: • Clarification on what exists now with LHJ school programs. • More information is needed about the NY model to see if it would work in Washington State such as roles and responsibilities of the H&S committee and are they able to react quickly to issues? • Concerns voiced for another unfunded mandate and more inspection fees. Also disagrees that lead is a statewide issue. 20-30% of schools nationwide have lead as an issue. • A few Educational Service Districts (ESD) already sample and are able to keep sampling costs low because of consortium. • A few LHJs have established school programs but most do not • How do we move funding from the urban areas out to rural areas to help schools out with this issue?

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
ACTION	**None. Information sharing.**
Review of Agenda Working Agreement Sound Science Meliss Maxfield Handouts 1 - 3	Meliss high lighted ground rules, scientific principles and decision-making process that were discussed at the November 30th meeting. Extra copies of the ground rules, decision-making process and sound science document were made available at the meeting.
ACTION	**None. Information sharing.**
Review of the Water Quality Issues Matrix Meliss Maxfield Handout 4	The workgroup reviewed the Water Quality Issues Matrix and added the following items: 1. Add pH, arsenic, Manganese (Mn), TDS, hardness (alkalinity) 2. Bacterial: 2 sub-categories of Coliform; 3. Backflow prevention and sanitary seals 4. Identified adding Items in #1 to testing frequency 5. Indoor air quality (IAQ) issues identified include Legionella and where high copper or iron is in the water this could imply a corrosion problem in the wall, resulting in a mold issue (especially with galvanized pipe) 6. Look at other liners used, cement, etc. Health affects concerns from leachates from the epoxy liners that they may be endocrine disrupters. 7. Building code issues identified include calling out for 'zero' lead instead of 'no' lead and concerns about dead lines and stagnation problems already addressed. 8. Clarified what certification of materials could entail (*e.g.* school district requires that architect or contractor certify that building/products are lead free.) Additional discussion included: • Monitoring of breakdown products from chlorination is already covered under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). • Look at a general approach to the whole issue of children's health (don't get too disease specific).
ACTION	**If source water does not exceed arsenic standard then it is not likely to increase as the water moves through the plumbing system, therefore, a standard does not need to be developed and can be dropped. Backflow prevention as well as well construction standards are covered by existing regulations and can also be dropped.**
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Overview of the General Regulatory Overview of Public Water System Rules and Structure EPA National Primary Drinking Water Standards Public Water System Water Quality Monitoring Requirements Quick Reference Guide Meliss Maxfield Handouts 5 – 7	Meliss walked the workgroup through the three documents showing that public water supplies are required to meet EPA's National Primary Drinking Water Standards. She also pointed out that these standards are health based. EPA also has Secondary standard that are not health based and cause aesthetic problems (taste, odor, staining). State regulations chapter 246-290 WAC adopts by reference EPA standards plus has addition state specific requirements for items like planning, operating permits, etc. Public water system must sample according to a set schedule, report and notify unsatisfactory results in a prescribe manner, and design for treatment if necessary. The Lead and Copper Rule (LCR) uses a tiered sampling schedule (Tier 1, 2, &3) based on age of buildings. Single family homes have to be looked at first and schools are not included if there are enough Tier 1 sites. Florida includes schools as one of the samples sites. Utilities are only responsible for water to the meter or property line. Schools not on their own water system are not regulated by the federal government. Flushing often used to remove lead from pipes but there is a rebound concern of lead going back and this can occur as soon as 10 minutes after flushing.

Overview of the General Regulatory Overview of Public Water System Rules and Structure EPA National Primary Drinking Water Standards Public Water System Water Quality Monitoring Requirements Quick Reference Guide Meliss Maxfield Handouts 5 – 7	The applicability of Lead Contamination Control Act (LCCA) of the SDWA was determined unconstitutional under the 10th Amendment for requiring testing and remedying lead contamination and coolers in schools. The reporting of water quality results was left intact. SDWA does not provide EPA with direct enforcement authority with respect to LCCA.
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Lead and Copper Rule & 1991 Status Report Lead Contamination Control Act Health Schools Materials Derrick Dennis Handouts 8 - 10	Derrick explained the LCR with a power point presentation. Utilities are required to meet 15 ppb for lead. He also noted that source water in Washington State is not high in lead. He also shared an information packet that was used with the Fall DOH School EH&S workshops. Derrick shared with the workgroup that if lead or copper exceeds limits, public education, monitoring, source testing, water quality monitored, and treatment to reduce corrosiveness of water needs to occur. The workgroup discussed: • What should be the standard in a building over and above what you are delivered by the purveyor? • Is there a way to know the water quality being delivered to a school? • Schools need to be talking with the utility to help sort out water quality concerns. • Concerns voice about schools having to put in treatment. • Adding treatment may result in additional requirements to be met. • Need strong reasons to go above established federal standards • Most school districts are working with 15 ppb standard. • Paint and contaminated soils have a much higher exposure impact for lead in children. 10-20% of exposure through water. • Having tiered solutions using best management practices makes a lot of sense • Schools that are their own water systems may be eligible for State Revolving funds if treatment needs to be installed. • There are various corrosion control treatment methods to reduce corrosiveness of water (manganese oxide system and reverse osmosis filtration water coolers mentioned).
ACTION	**A list of systems that exceed the lead and copper rule will be provided to the workgroup.**
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Water quality issue discussion Meliss Maxfield	Meliss asked the workgroup where they wanted to begin coming up with recommendations. The workgroup indicated that they would start with the first issue identified in the Water Workgroup Issues document and work their way though to the end. Tin was added to the list of water issues as a concern. The workgroup also discussed: • We need to focus on what the school needs to test for, how often and based on what standard. • Epoxy coatings need to have a supplier/manufacturing certification on leachate potential.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Water quality issue discussion - continued	• Buy-in and acceptance by Superintendents will be necessary. • Can DOH be more directly involved in this monitoring? • A consortium of northern districts through ESD has been successful in holding testing costs down ($9/sampe). • How can ESDs find out how many purveyors service their districts? • Everett school district samples 1200 samples/year on a 3 to 4 year rotation to do all fixtures. Have sampled for lead now going to do some cadmium and copper.
ACTION	**Send any reference materials to Meliss so she can distribute them to workgroup members.**

HANDOUTS	NEXT MEETING
1. Agenda 2. Working Agreement 3. Sound Science 4. Water Quality Issues Matrix 5. General Regulatory Overview of Public Water System Rules and Structure 6. EPA National Primary Drinking Water Standards 7. Public Water System Water Quality Monitoring Requirements Quick Reference Guide 8. Power Point Presentation on the Lead and Copper Rule 9. 1991 Status Report Lead Contamination Control Act 10. Healthy Schools Materials	Tuesday, February 8, 2005 9:00 am to 3:00 pm Puget Sound Educational Service District 400 SW 152nd St., Burien, WA 98166 http://www.psesd.org/maps/html/maps_dir.shtml